

Airina L. Rodrigues
(Admitted *pro hac vice*)
Lindsey A. McDougall (SBN 13618)
Matthew J. McKissick (SBN 15281)
Jamie P. Leavitt (SBN 16268)
BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP
100 North City Parkway, Suite 1600
Las Vegas, NV 89106-4614
Telephone: 702.382.2101
Facsimile: 702.382.8135
Email: arodrigues@bhfs.com
lmcdougall@bhfs.com
mmckissick@bhfs.com
jleavitt@bhfs.com

Matthew D. Francis (SBN 6978)
BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP
5520 Kietzke Lane, Suite 110
Reno, NV 89511
Telephone: 775.324.4100
Facsimile: 775.333.8171
Email: mfrancis@bhfs.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff, Marzen Media LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

MARZEN MEDIA LLC, a Nevada limited
liability company,

Plaintiff,

v.

FL NEWSLETTER LLC, a Delaware limited
liability company, doing business as FANTASY
LIFE,

Defendant.

CASE NO.: 2:24-cv-01883-APG-EJY

~~[PROPOSED]~~ JOINT DISCOVERY
PLAN AND SCHEDULING ORDER

**SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW
REQUESTED**

Pursuant to Local Rule 26-1, the parties submit their proposed discovery plan and
scheduling order as follows:

///

///

I. MEETING

On February 18, 2025, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) and LR 26-1(a), the parties held their Rule 26(f) conference, which was attended by Airina L. Rodrigues, Matthew D. Francis, Matthew J. McKissick, and Jamie P. Leavitt on behalf of Plaintiff Marzen Media LLC (“Plaintiff”), and Amanda G. Hyland and Seth K. Trimble on behalf of Defendant FL Newsletter LLC (“Defendant”).

II. STATEMENT WHY SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW IS REQUESTED

The claims at issue in Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint involve, among other things, allegations of copyright infringement and trade secret misappropriation, which will involve the production and comparison of computer source code by expert witnesses, as well as substantial written and oral discovery of parties and third parties located throughout the United States. Additionally, Plaintiff intends to take written and oral discovery of third parties, including former employees of Plaintiff who now work for Defendant, and potentially including third party software developers, which will require additional travel. Similarly, Defendant intends to take written and oral discovery of third parties which will require additional travel. For these reasons, the parties request to extend and modify the standard discovery time period of 180 days to 300 days pursuant to LR 26-1(a), along with the modification of the 30 day periods (to 45 days) for service of rebuttal expert disclosures, dispositive motions, and the pretrial order as set forth below.

III. DISCOVERY AND SCHEDULING DEADLINES

The parties propose the following discovery and scheduling deadlines:

<u>Event</u>	<u>Proposed Deadline</u>
Discovery Cut-Off Date - LR 26-1(b)(1)	November 13, 2025
Exchange of Initial Disclosures	Fourteen (14) days after entry of this Order

Amending the Pleadings and Adding Parties - LR 26-1(b)(2)	August 15, 2025
Service of Expert Disclosures Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2) - LR 26-1(b)(3)	September 15, 2025
Service of Rebuttal Expert Disclosures Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2)(D) - LR 26-1(b)(3)	October 30, 2025
Dispositive Motions - LR 26-1(b)(4)	December 29, 2025
Pretrial Order (including Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3) Disclosures) - LR 26-1(b)(5)	February 12, 2026

IV. ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION

The parties certify that they met and conferred about the possibility of using an alternative dispute-resolution processes.

V. ALTERNATIVE FORMS OF CASE DISPOSITION

The parties certify that they considered consenting to trial by a magistrate judge under 28 U.S. C. § 636(c) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 73 and using the Short Trial Program (General Order 2013-01). Presently, neither party intends to proceed in this manner.

VI. ELECTRONIC EVIDENCE

The parties certify that they discussed whether they intend to present evidence in electronic format to jurors for the purposes of jury deliberations. The parties anticipate presenting such evidence. The parties will work cooperatively to reach stipulations regarding providing discovery in an electronic format compatible with the court's electronic jury evidence display system. The parties will also submit a proposed ESI protocol for electronic discovery in this action.

VII. OTHER ISSUES

A. The parties agree that this case does not warrant a departure from the presumptive limits on the number of depositions and interrogatories set forth in Fed. R. Civ. P. 30, 31, and 33. It is anticipated that depositions will be recorded by audiovisual or stenographic means, as appropriate and desired.

B. The parties agree that all discovery requests and responses and any other discovery-related documents shall be served on counsel via electronic mail. Such electronic service shall be deemed effective on the date sent and shall not trigger any additional time to respond or otherwise act. To comply with LR 26-7, originals of responses to written discovery requests must also be served on the party who served the discovery requests, and that party must make the originals available at the pretrial hearing, at trial, or when ordered by the court. Notwithstanding anything stated herein to the contrary, documents produced in response to Rule 34 Requests shall be produced electronically through an FTP site or its equivalent, or as otherwise agreed by the parties.

C. The parties anticipate that confidential, privileged, commercially sensitive, and proprietary information may be disclosed as part of this litigation. To that end, the parties are working cooperatively to prepare a stipulated protective order, which will be submitted to this Court.

D. The parties anticipate that electronically stored information (“ESI”) may be implicated in this case and will work together to formulate a mutually-agreeable ESI protocol.

E. The parties agree that privileged communications that occurred after the filing of the original complaint in this action, or in direct response to Plaintiff’s initial demands to Defendant, do not have to be listed on a privilege log.

F. The parties agree that pursuant to LR 26-1(c) they may, but are not required to, request a conference with the assigned magistrate judge prior to filing a discovery motion.

G. The parties agree to electronic service based upon the Court’s CM-ECF system or, for non-court communications, via the following cumulative service lists:

Plaintiff	Title	Defendants
Airina L. Rodrigues Lindsey A. McDougall Matthew D. Francis Matthew J. McKissick Jamie P. Leavitt	<i>Counsel</i>	Elizabeth B. Stallard Amanda G. Hyland Seth K. Trimble Austin C. Vining
Jeff Tillison	<i>Paralegal</i>	Valarie Lawrence
	<i>Secretary / Other</i>	N/A
arodrigues@bhfs.com lmcdougall@bhfs.com mfrancis@bhfs.com mmckissick@bhfs.com jleavitt@bhfs.com jtillison@bhfs.com	<i>Cumulative Email List</i>	estallard@buchalter.com ahyland@buchalter.com strimble@buchalter.com avining@buchalter.com vlawrence@buchalter.com

DATED this 4th day of March, 2025

BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER
SCHRECK, LLP

By: /s/ Airina L. Rodrigues
Airina L. Rodrigues
(Admitted *pro hac vice*)
Lindsey A. McDougall (SBN 13618)
Matthew J. McKissick (SBN 15281)
Jamie P. Leavitt (SBN 16268)
100 North City Pkwy, Suite 1600
Las Vegas, NV 89106-4614
Telephone: 702.382.2101

Matthew D. Francis (SBN 6978)
5520 Kietzke Lane, Suite 110
Reno, NV 89511
Telephone: 775.324.4100

*Attorneys for Plaintiff,
Marzen Media LLC*

BUCHALTER
A Professional Corporation

By: /s/ Seth K. Trimble
Elizabeth B. Stallard
500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1900
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone: 916.945.5170

Amanda G. Hyland
(Admitted *pro hac vice*)
Seth K. Trimble
(Admitted *pro hac vice*)
Austin C. Vining
(Admitted *pro hac vice*)
3350 Riverwood Pkwy. SE, Ste. 1900
Atlanta, GA 30339
Telephone: 404.832.7530

*Attorneys for Defendant,
FL Newsletter LLC*

IT IS SO ORDERED:


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DATED: March 4, 2025